



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/739,208      | 12/18/2003  | Daniel Kuzmich       | 9/272               | 1223             |

28509 7590 03/14/2007

MICHAEL P. MORRIS  
BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM CORPORATION  
900 RIDGEBURY ROAD  
P O BOX 368  
RIDGEFIELD, CT 06877-0368

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

SEAMAN, D MARGARET M

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

1625

| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE  | DELIVERY MODE |
|--|------------|---------------|
| 3 MONTHS                               | 03/14/2007 | PAPER         |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

|                              |                                       |                                       |  |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/739,208  | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>KUZMICH ET AL. |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>D. Margaret Seaman | <b>Art Unit</b><br>1625               |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                                  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____   |

### DETAILED ACTION

The elected group I is in condition for allowance due to the terminal disclaimer of paper dated 11/6/2006. Claims 1-8 are objected to as containing non-elected material. The rejection was made final in paper dated 7/5/2006. Claims 9-15 have been rejoined with the elected group I claims and will be examined to the extent that they read upon the elected group I.

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. Claims 1-8 directed to an allowable product. Pursuant to the procedures set forth in MPEP § 821.04(B), claims 9-15, directed to the process of making or using an allowable product, previously withdrawn from consideration as a result of a restriction requirement, is hereby rejoined and fully examined for patentability under 37 CFR 1.104 as far as the elected grouping of group I wherein compounds and methods of use of formula (IA) wherein R<sup>1</sup> is phenyl.

Because all claims previously withdrawn from consideration under 37 CFR 1.142 have been rejoined, **the restriction requirement as set forth in the Office action mailed on 4/10/2006 is hereby withdrawn as far as groups I and groups XIII, XIV, XV and XVI.** In view of the withdrawal of the restriction requirement as to the rejoined inventions, applicant(s) are advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application,

Art Unit: 1625

such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Once the restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. See *In re Ziegler*, 443 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

1. This application contains claims 1-15 (in part) and 16-28 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. dated 5/12/2006. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

2. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

### ***Double Patenting***

1. The rejection of claims on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting, is withdrawn due to the terminal disclaimer of 11/6/2006.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The instant specification does not adequately describe the nexus between the modulation of the glucocorticoid receptor and a useful treatment of a disease/condition. Modulation of a receptor involves antagonism, inhibition, agonism and others. These modulations are sometimes opposite reactions to the same receptor. It is not seen where the instant specification adequately describes the nexus between the modulation of the glucocorticoid receptor and a useful treatment of a single disease or condition.

3. Claims 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

Art Unit: 1625

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue". These factors include 1) the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the level of predictability in the art, 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor, 7) the existence of working examples, and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

- 1) The breadth of the claims,
- 2) The nature of the invention,
- 3) The state of the prior art,
- 4) The level of one of ordinary skill,
- 5) The level of predictability in the art,
- 6) The amount of direction provided by the inventor,
- 7) The existence of working examples,
- 8) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

**The nature of the invention:** The nature of the invention is the method of treating a disorder that is modulated by the glucocorticoid receptor.

**The state of the prior art:** The state of the prior art is that it involves screening in vitro and in vivo to determine which compounds exhibit the desired

Art Unit: 1625

pharmacological activities (i.e. what compounds can treat which specific disease). There is no absolute predictability even in view of the seemingly high level of skill in the art. The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any therapeutic regimen on its face. Those of skill in the art recognize that in vitro assays and or cell-cultured based assays are generally useful to observe basic physiological and cellular phenomenon such as screening the effects of potential drugs. However, clinical correlations are generally lacking. The greatly increased complexity of the in vivo environment as compared to the very narrowly defined and controlled conditions of an in- vitro assay does not permit a single extrapolation of in vitro assays to human diagnostic efficacy with any reasonable degree of predictability. In vitro assays cannot easily assess cell-cell interactions that may be important in a particular pathological state. Furthermore it is well known in the art that cultured cells, over a period time, lose phenotypic characteristics associated with their normal counterpart cell type. Freshney (Culture of Animal Cells, A Manual of Basic Technique, Alan R. Liss, Inc., 1983, New York, p4) teach that it is recognized in the art that there are many differences between cultured cells and their counterparts *in vivo*. These differences stem from the dissociation of cells from a three-dimensional geometry and their propagation on a two-dimensional substrate. Specific cell interactions characteristic of histology of the tissue are

lost. The culture environment lacks the input of the nervous and endocrine systems involved in homeostatic regulation *in vivo*. Without this control, cellular metabolism may be more constant *in vitro* but may not be truly representative of the tissue from which the cells were derived. This has often led to tissue culture being regarded in a rather skeptical light (p. 4, see Major Differences *In Vitro*). Further, although drawn specifically to cancer cells, Dermer (Bio/Technology, 1994, 12:320) teaches that, "petri dish cancer" is a poor representation of malignancy, with characteristics profoundly different from the human disease. Further, Dermer teaches that when a normal or malignant body cell adapts to immortal life in culture, it takes an evolutionary type step that enables the new line to thrive in its artificial environment. This step transforms a cell from one that is stable and differentiated to one that is not. Yet normal or malignant cells *in vivo* are not like that. The reference states that evidence of the contradictions between life on the bottom of a lab dish and in the body has been in the scientific literature for more than 30 years. Clearly it is well known in the art that cells in culture exhibit characteristics different from those *in vivo* and cannot duplicate the complex conditions of the *in vivo* environment involved in host-tumor and cell-cell interactions.

**The predictability in the art:** It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. In re Fisher, 427 F. 2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970)



Art Unit: 1625

indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. In the instant case, the instantly claimed invention is highly unpredictable since one skilled in the art would recognize that in regards to the therapeutic effects of all diseases, whether or not the modulation of glucocorticoid receptors would make a difference in the disease. Hence, in the absence of a showing of a nexus between any and all known diseases and the modulation of glucocorticoid receptors, one of ordinary skill in the art is unable to fully predict possible results from the administration of the compound of claim 1 due to the unpredictability of the role of modulation of glucocorticoid receptors. Peeters (Stress, 2004) states that glucocorticoid receptor antagonists which block cortisol effects might have a benefit in diagnosis and treatment. And selective glucocorticoid receptor antagonists with in vivo potency have not been described thus far in the art. This shows the unpredictability in the art for glucocorticoid receptors.

**The presence or absence of working examples:** The compounds of the instant specification have not been tested for their ability to treat type II diabetes, obesity hypertension, neurological diseases, tumors or other diseases/conditions listed in the instant claims. Nor have the instant compounds been tested against known compounds having the same activity.

**The amount of direction or guidance present:** The guidance present in the specification is that of the compounds modulate the glucocorticoid receptor

Art Unit: 1625

function and therefore treat the disease states listed in the claims. Otherwise, there is no guidance provided for the treatment of conditions from diabetes to tumors to dermatological diseases. The specification does not seem to enable a correlation between the mediation of glucocorticoid receptors and the treatment of any and all diseases.

**The breadth of the claims:** The claims are drawn to the treatment of any and all diseases mediated by the glucocorticoid receptor with the compound of claim 1.

**The quantity of experimentation needed:** The quantity of experimentation needed is undue. One skilled in the art would need to determine what diseases out of all known diseases would be benefited by the mediation of glucocorticoid receptors and then would further need to determine which of the claimed compounds would provide treatment of the disease.

**The level of the skill in the art:** The level of skill in the art is high. However, due to the unpredictability in the pharmaceutical art, it is noted that each embodiment of the invention is required to be individually assessed for physiological activity by in vitro and in vivo screening to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activity and which diseases would benefit from this activity.

Thus, the specification fails to provide sufficient support of the broad use of the compounds of claim 1 for the treatment of any disease. As a result

Art Unit: 1625

necessitating one of ordinary skill to perform an exhaustive search for which diseases can be treated by which compound of claim 1 in order to practice the claimed invention.

Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S (CA FC) 42 USPQ2d 1001, states that “a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search, but compensation for its successful conclusion” and “[p]atent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable”.

Therefore, in view of the Wands factors and In re Fisher (CCPA 1970) discussed above, to practice the claimed invention herein, one of ordinary skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation to test which diseases can be treated by the compounds of the instant claims, with no assurance of success.

This rejection can be overcome by deleting the claims.

### *Claim Objections*

4. Claims 1-8 are objected to because of the following informalities: the non-elected material remain in the claims. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Allowable Subject Matter*

1. Claims 1-8 (limited to the elected group I) are free of prior art.

*Conclusion*

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. Margaret Seaman whose telephone number is 571-272-0694. The examiner can normally be reached on 730am-4pm, Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas McKenzie can be reached on 571-272-0670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



D. Margaret Seaman  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1625

dms